Response to Official Action Dated 18 March 2008 Re: USSN 10/817,333

Page 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Objection to Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 10 to thereby obviate the Examiner's objection to claim 12.

Prior Art based Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 14-16 were rejected as allegedly being fully anticipated by Chen (US Patent No. 7096204). This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed.

As disclosed in the present application, the level or amount of disclosure made to a second party of the first party' information may vary depending on the trust than can be placed in the data processing systems involved in the transaction with that second party is particularly useful feature. See, e.g., paragraph 0048 of the present application.

In Chen trust appears to be a go or no go situation. Chen does not teach "providing data about the first entity to the second entity where data is selectively withheld or generalised in response to the assessment of trust" as required by claim 1.

The Examiner cites col. 1, l. 42 through col 2, l. 10 of Chen as meeting this limitation. But the passage in Chen cited by the Examiner mentions that the broker provides authorisation for a proposed transaction. It does not teach of suggest that data about the purchaser is <u>selectively withheld or generalised</u> in response to the assessment of trust" as required by claim 1.

Chen, while interesting, is just not particularly relevant to claim 1 or the claims which depend therefrom. Claim 1 is patentable over Chen.

Claim 14 recites that "information about the first entity is selectively withheld or generalised in response to the assessment of the amount of trust

Response to Official Action Dated 18 March 2008 Re: USSN 10/817,333 Page 10

attributed to the second data processor" which clearly serves to distinguish claim 14 from Chen.

Claims 3-5, 7-8, 10-13 are rejected as allegedly being obvious over Chen in view of Maury (US Pat Pub 2002004064. This grounds for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Chen has already been discussed. Maury discloses a system for providing insurance quotations online. The user data is provided in the form of a profile to a server, which determines the level of risk associated with the user and obtains quotations as a result. While there are conventional approaches taken to maintaining privacy of the user data (user names, passwords, etc.), there does not appear to be any way in which the user data can be selectively passed to one insurance entity and not another based on an assessment of a level of trust via-a-vis the insurance entity.

So it is not understood how Maury helps overcome the deficiency noted above vis-a-vis Chen.

Claim 10, as amended, includes the limitation "the trusted computer interrogates the data processing environment and policies of the third party to determine how trustworthy the third parties is, and and selectively adjusts an amount of information which it discloses about the customer on the basis of the determination of trustworthiness" which defines over Chen and the Examiner has not pointed to anything in Maury which addresses this deficiency of Chen.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Response to Official Action Dated 18 March 2008 Re: USSN 10/817,333

Page 11

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this paper (and any enclosure referred to in this paper) is being transmitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on Respectfully submitted,

June 17, 2008
(Date of Transmission)
Stacey Dawson
(Name of Person Transmitting)
/Stacey Dawson/
(Signature)
June 17, 2008 (Date)

/Richard P. Berg 28,145/

Richard Berg Attorney for the Applicant Reg. No. 28,145 LADAS & PARRY 5670 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 2100 Los Angeles, CA 90036 (323) 934-2300 voice (323) 934-0202 facsimile